UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,762	01/25/2001	Robert A. Wright	17887004500	7760

7590 06/04/2004

Steve Y. Cho
TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
8th Floor
Two Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
LEE, PHILIP C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	7

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/770,762	WRIGHT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip C Lee	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5 and 6*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 8, 10, 13-15, 20-24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al, U.S. Patent 6,625,624 (hereinafter Chen) in view of Mathur et al, U.S. Patent 6,704,807 (hereinafter Mathur).

4. As per claims 1, 10, 13, 21-24 and 26-28 Chen taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

a first client having a first proxy (col. 2, lines 59-67; fig. 1), and a first memory (col. 3, lines 20-21); and

a server having a second proxy (col. 2, lines 7-9; fig. 1; col. 3, lines 54-55; col. 5, lines 6-9), a second memory (col. 3, lines 20-21),

wherein the first proxy and second proxy are configured to form a communication link with the other (col. 3, lines 29-32, 54-55).

5. Chen did not teach partitioning the memory into a plurality of slots and each slot being assigned to one of the plurality of processes. Mathur taught comprising:

a plurality of processes, the memory having a plurality of slots, each slot being assigned to one of the plurality of processes (col. 7, lines 61-col. 8, lines 14) and configured to store data to be transmitted or received by the assigned process (inherently comprised).

6. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Mathur because Mathur's method of assigning memory slot to a process would increase the reliability of Chen's system by avoiding error due to applications accessing memory outside of their allocated slot (col. 8, lines 5-7).

7. As per claims 2 and 14, Chen and Mathur taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 13 above. Chen further taught wherein the first client is a web server and the server is an executing server (col. 3, lines 24-34), further including:

a second client, wherein the second client is a client of the first client (fig. 1; col. 2, lines 67-col. 3, lines 19).

8. As per claims 3 and 15, Chen and Mathur taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 2 and 14 above. Chen further taught wherein the first client is a web server and the second client is a browser (col. 1, lines 32-36; col. 2, lines 59-col. 3, lines 19).

9. As per claims 8 and 20, Chen and Mathur taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 13 above. Chen further taught wherein there are a plurality of the first clients and a plurality of the servers (fig. 1; col. 1, lines 31-36).

10. Claims 4-5, 6-7, 9, 11-12, 16-19, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Mathur in view of Lanteigne et al, U.S. Patent 6,557,056.

11. As per claim 9, Chen taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

a plurality of browsers (fig. 1; col. 1, lines 31-36);

a plurality of web servers to handle requests from the plurality of browsers (col. 2, lines 7-9; col. 2, lines 63-col. 3, lines 19), each web server having a first proxy (col. 2, lines 59-67; fig. 1), and a first shared memory (col. 3, lines 20-21); and

a plurality of executing servers to communicate with the web servers (fig. 1; col. 2, lines 67-col. 3, lines 19), each executing server having a second proxy (col. 2, lines 7-9; fig. 1; col. 3, lines 54-55; col. 5, lines 6-9), and a second memory (col. 3, lines 20-21),

wherein the first proxy and second proxy are configured to form a communication link with the other (col. 3, lines 29-32, 54-55).

12. Chen did not teach partitioning the memory into a plurality of slots and each slot being assigned to one of the plurality of processes. Mathur taught comprising:

a plurality of processes, the memory having a plurality of slots, each slot being assigned to one of the plurality of processes (col. 7, lines 61-col. 8, lines 14) and configured to store data to be transmitted or received by the assigned process (inherently comprised).

13. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen and Mathur because Mathur's method of assigning memory slot to a process would increase the reliability of Chen's system by avoiding error due to applications accessing memory outside of their allocated slot (col. 8, lines 5-7).

14. Chen and Mathur did not teach mark device for indicating whether data can be written or read from the slots by the processes. Lanteigne taught mark devices being assigned to the slots and being operable to indicate whether data can be written or read from the slots by the processes (col. 9, lines 37-42; col. 6, lines 7-36).

15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen, Mathur and Lanteigne because Lanteigne's method of mark device would increase the application's alertness of Chen's and Mathur's systems by providing notification to software application that a message has been enqueued into a receive queue for the particular software application (col. 16, lines 8-11)

16. As per claims 4 and 16, Chen and Mathur taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 13 above. Chen and Mathur did not teach input/output space to temporarily store data received/transmitted. Lanteigne further taught wherein each of the first slots, includes:

a first input space to temporarily store data to be transmitted to a destination node via the first proxy, wherein the data is generated by the first process that is associated with the first input space (col. 13, lines 5-31); and

a first output space to temporarily store data received from a source node via the first proxy, wherein the data received is directed to the first process that is associated with the first output space (col. 13, lines 5-31).

17. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chen, Mathur and Lanteigne because Lanteigne's method of input/output space would increase the flexibility of Chen's and Mathur's systems by allowing different software applications enqueue data at their own speed without significantly impacting other software applications (col. 13, lines 29-31).

18. As per claims 5, 17, 25 and 29, Chen, Mathur and Lanteigne taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 4, 16, 24 and 28 above. Lanteigne further taught including a plurality of mark devices, each mark device being assigned to one of the first input spaces to indicate whether data can be written into the first input space to which the mark device is assigned and to one of the first output spaces to indicated whether the first output space to which

the mark device is assigned contains data received from the source node via the first proxy (col. 9, lines 37-42; col. 16, lines 7-36).

19. As per claims 6, 11 and 18, Chen, Mathur and Lanteigne taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 5, 10 and 16 above. Lanteigne further taught wherein each of the second slots, includes:

a second input space to temporarily store data to be transmitted to a destination node via the second proxy, wherein the data is generated by the second process that is associated with the second input space (col. 13, lines 5-31); and

a second output space to temporarily store data received from a source node via the second proxy, wherein the data received is directed to the second process that is associated with the second output space (col. 13, lines 5-31).

20. As per claims 7, 12 and 19, Chen, Mathur and Lanteigne taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 6, 11 and 18 above. Lanteigne further taught including a plurality of mark devices, each mark device being assigned to one of the second input spaces to indicate whether data can be written into the second input space to which the mark device is assigned and to one of the second output spaces to indicate whether the second output space to which the mark device is assigned contains data received from the source node via the second proxy (col. 9, lines 37-42; col. 16, lines 7-36).

CONCLUSION

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Anupam et al, U.S. Patent 6,687,739, disclosed a method for client interaction with proxy servers.

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (703)305-7721. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

25. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)350-6121.

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100